



THE NACOLE REVIEW

Spring 2001

In this issue:

- 1 President's report
Sue Quinn
- 2 NACOLE history
Board of directors
- 3 Las Vegas
Andrea Beckman
- 4 Riverside, California
Don Williams
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
David Heard
- 5 Miami-Dade County
Dr. Eduardo I. Diaz
- 6 San Jose, California
Teresa Guerrero-Daley
- 7 Membership Form
- 9 Claremont, California
Ellen Taylor
- 10 Fresno, California
Pasquale Carbone
- 13 Resources for civilian oversight
- 14 Seventh annual conference

President's Report: A drive for accountability

In the midst of this year, while an energy crisis grips California, the drive for more police accountability generates intense energy in jurisdictions throughout the U.S., sparked by citizens unwilling to vacantly witness problematic police activities and avert their eyes.

NACOLE's Annual Conference, *Inclusion: The Balancing Act of Civilian Oversight*, will be held October 9 - 12, 2001, in Denver, Colorado, at the Adam's Mark Hotel.

Newspapers report on what is being done to improve the quality of services police provide their cities, to improve relations between citizens and cops, and to keep cities safe without damage to civil rights. And much of the work involves the deepening and widening of civilian oversight.

From Miami to Seattle, and San Diego to Boston, we found examples of citizens carrying on the painstaking, time-consuming work of policy and incident review:

continued on page 10 >>

by NACOLE President *Sue Quinn*

A brief history of NACOLE

In 1993, several members of the U.S. delegation to the International Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (IACOLE) conference in Cambridge, Massachusetts met to discuss issues of mutual concern relating to civilian oversight within the United States. The agenda of this meeting was the formation of a national organization to address the specific needs of civilians organized for law enforcement oversight.

At the 1994 IACOLE

conference in Orlando, Florida, U.S. delegates continued to discuss the creation of the new national organization. In April of 1995, a group of individuals met in Landover, Maryland and approved the articles of incorporation and preliminary bylaws. On May 16, 1995, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) began its operations.

As NACOLE continues to grow, the relationship between police and community - particularly

the minority community - continues to be one of the most critical social issues facing this country. The number of civilian oversight agencies in the U.S. has significantly increased. Of the nation's 100 largest cities, 71 have citizen review mechanisms. Since 1996, NACOLE has assisted many cities in their establishment of systems.

NACOLE recognizes that the majority of law enforcement officers strive, often under

dangerous and demanding circumstances, to carry out their duties in a restrained, lawful and professional manner. Despite this, the United States has a growing crisis of police misconduct. Citizens want to feel secure that police officers are in the community to serve and protect all citizens of that community. We believe that citizens have a right to assurance that adequate mechanisms are available to review and investigate questionable or unacceptable actions of law enforcement officers. ■

Board of Directors

President

Sue Quinn
San Diego, CA
(619) 294-3205

Past President

Brian C. Reeder
Indianapolis, IN
(317) 327-3429

Vice President

Malvina Monteiro
Cambridge, MA
(617) 349-6155

Secretary

Barbara Attard
Berkeley, CA
(510) 644-6716

Treasurer

Clyde B. Davis
Lanham, MD
(301) 731-5808

Members-at-Large

Bob Aaronson
Palo Alto, CA
(650) 565-8800

Donald Casimere
Sacramento, CA
(916) 264-5704

Teresa Guerrero-Daily
San Jose, CA
(408) 794-6226

James L. Johnson
Cincinnati, OH
(513) 352-6990

Joseph Sandoval
Denver, CO
(303) 556-3161

Dede Wilhelm
Kauai, HI
(808) 448-8750

You can email NACOLE board members at the NACOLE website, www.nacole.org.

Who we are: *Las Vegas*

from Andrea Beckman
Executive Director
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
Department Civilian Review

In May of 1999, the City and County of Las Vegas passed reciprocal ordinances for the creation and funding of a civilian review board, as per the authority given to the entities by statute. In authorizing the funds for the board, the city and county each agreed to pay a pro-rata share of the approximately \$200,000 per year budget.

There are only two paid positions, that of the executive director, who is also legal counsel for the Board, and one secretary. There are twenty five volunteer citizens on the board who are randomly selected to sit in panels of five as either a screening panel or a hearing panel.

The screening panels may accept and review initial complaints or review complaints after the Internal Affairs Bureau has investigated them. The Board has the authority to refer a case to the department (IAB) for further investigation if the board feels the allegations of the complaint have merit and warrant further investigation. However, the Review Board is not authorized to do their own investigations.

The board may receive and review an investigation done by IAB and determine that the investigation was insufficient or that they disagree with the findings of the bureau, in which case the screening panel may refer the case for an evidentiary hearing to a separate panel called the hearing panel.

The hearing panel is composed of five randomly selected individuals from the entire review board, who are not presently sitting on a screening panel. The panel has subpoena power and may conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine whether or not the allegations of the complaint involving misconduct are proven by a preponderance of the evidence or are unfounded.

The hearing panel then makes findings either agreeing or disagreeing with the findings of the Internal Affairs Bureau of the department and makes recommendations to the Sheriff as to exoneration of the officer, increase in recommended penalties or decrease in recommended penalties. The sheriff then can decide whether or not he wants to follow the recommendations of the review board.

The Review Board has the authority to consider any complaint involving allegations of misconduct filed by a citizen against a peace officer employed by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department including professional discourtesy, harassment, discrimination, racial slurs, bias or profiling, unlawful arrests, excessive use of force and any other allegation that involves a

violation of metro's policy and procedures established for peace officers where a citizen is involved. The Review Board also has the authority to render opinions to the Sheriff regarding policy and procedures issues that they see that may need changes.

Beckman was appointed executive director in April, 2000. The members of the Civilian Review Board in Las Vegas were sworn in on October 12, 2000. The volunteers are selected by the two city council members of the Fiscal Affairs Committee and the two county commissioners from the Fiscal Affairs Committee. ■

Who are we?

In this issue of the NACOLE Review we profile review boards around the country. How are they organized? What do they do? What can other cities learn from them? Join us as NACOLE members take this opportunity to share their experiences with the wider community.

Who we are: Riverside, California

Lethal force death spurs creation of police review commission

In the aftermath of Tyisha Miller's lethal force death, the Riverside City Council, by a unanimous vote, created the Community Police Review Commission on April 11, 2000. The Commission is a monitoring model with authorization to conduct it's own investigations via private investigators.

The Commission consists of nine members who were selected and sworn in during the month of July 2000. The terms for the commissioners is 4 years, except for the initial term with three commissioners serving 2 years, three serving 3 years and the remaining three serving a full 4 year term. Each commissioner can be reappointed once.

The staff for the commis-

sion consists of the Executive Director and a secretary. The initial budget for the commission was set at \$185,000 and is expected to increase to the \$200,000 - \$250,000 range in fiscal year 2001-2002.

The first commission meeting was held on November 16, 2000 where an interim chair and vice-chair were selected. It was also decided, by lot, which commissioner's initial term would be 2, 3 and 4 years long and it was decided that the Commission would meet regularly on the fourth Monday of each month at 6:00 PM.

Also in the November meeting the commissioners divided themselves into two committees to write the Rules and

*from Don Williams,
Executive Director
Riverside Police Review Commission*

Regulations. It is expected that the Rules and Regulations will be in place by the February monthly meeting which will be held on the forth Monday of the month.

The training schedule is being finalized at this time and it is expected that the training will begin after the Christmas and New Years holidays. The training will last approximately six weeks and will conclude in the middle of February. *NACOLE assisted Riverside in the New Board Training design; see the recommended New Board Training outline at NACOLE's website, www.nacole.org.*

It is expected that the Commission will start deliberating cases in the February meeting, however prior to that the commission is expected to ask for a legal opinion regarding the amount of information that can be released to the public from an internal affairs investigation. This classic case of the public's right to know versus the officers right to privacy that has been a bone of contention between the city and the community. In the December meeting the commission will discuss whether or not to ask for a legal opinion from an attorney outside of the City Attorney's office to help resolve this issue. ■

Who we are: Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Oldest civil service authority in Wisconsin

*from David Heard
Public Relations Officer*

The Milwaukee Fire and Police Commission is a civilian body which oversees general policy, and acts as the employment agency in the Milwaukee Fire Department and the Milwaukee Police Department. Responsibility for day-to-day operation of

the Departments rests with their chiefs. Regular business meetings are held twice each month except August. The meetings are open to the public, and agendas are published in advance.

The Board of Fire and Police Commissioners, which was established in 1885, is the oldest civil service authority in Wisconsin, as well as the first

continued on next page>>

Who we are: Miami - Dade County, Florida

Unique panel has wide jurisdiction

from Dr. Eduardo I. Diaz

The Independent Review Panel (IRP) was established in Miami-Dade County, by ordinance, in 1980. It has been tweaked several times since then, but it remains a distinctive Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement model in that its jurisdiction extends to all other county employees, departments and instrumentalities as well.

The process is complaint driven and involves three stages of progressive mediation for serious cases, culminating in a public hearing before the nine member Panel. Composed of citizen volunteers, five Panel members are group appointments by the County Commission based on nominations from the local League of Women Voters, Bar Association, Community Relations Board, Community Action Agency and

Chiefs of Police Association. The other four are appointed by fellow Panel members taking into consideration ethno-cultural diversity.

The IRP model is a hybrid-monitoring model that relies on moral authority and the public airing of alleged wrongdoing to accomplish its mandate, "external fact-finding and dispute resolution." Independence is achieved, in part, by having the Executive Director appointed by the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court. The small staff of five is supported by a County General Fund budget of \$404,000 for the current fiscal year. Subpoena power is limited to whistle-blower retaliation cases and its ultimate role is an advisory one aimed at the Mayor, Commissioners, County Manager and Department

Directors, always assuring that the press is informed of the most serious cases.

The current Executive Director, Dr. Eduardo I. Diaz, is a Peace Psychologist with extensive experience in violence reduction, dispute resolution and community building. He is active with Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR), the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) and the Peace Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association (APA). Questions may be directed to him by emailing irp@co.miami-dade.fl.us, calling 305-375-4880, or faxing 305-375-4879. The IRP website, www.co.miami-dade.fl.us/irp, includes a brief history, the enabling ordinance and current rules of procedure. ■

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

(continued)

such commission to be established by law in the United States. The original Commission consisted of four members that were to remove the fire and police services from politics. The new law made the civilian Board of Commis-

sioners responsible for setting employment standards, testing candidates for positions in both safety services, and responsible for appointing both chiefs.

The Commission functions include: recruitment and testing for

entry-level positions in the Fire and Police Departments; testing for promotional positions; hearing appeals by members of either department who have been disciplined by their Chief; hearing citizen complaints; and general

policy oversight. A twelve-person staff is headed by an Executive Director, employees of the City of Milwaukee, and carry out the functions of the Commission. ■

Who we are: San Jose, California

from Teresa
Guerrero-Daley
Independent
Police Auditor, San
Jose, California

Background

In the aftermath of the Rodney King incident, the American political climate shifted towards demanding that each city employ a proactive approach to address police misconduct. A common belief voiced by the public, which still exists today, was that no matter how thorough, impartial and objective police departments handled citizen complaints, they could not be trusted to exclusively police themselves.

On September 13, 1993, the San Jose City Council passed an ordinance to establish the Office of the Independent Police Auditor (IPA). The IPA office was established as a pilot project, which would be evaluated after the first year of operation. Three years later, the IPA became a chartered city office through a vote in the November 1996

election. Two very important changes were voted in; one, it now requires a vote of the people to abolish the IPA office, and two, a super majority vote of the city council (ten of the eleven council members) is required before removal of the Police Auditor in midterm. The Auditor is appointed to four-year terms and reports directly to the Mayor and City Council.

The IPA Model

When the IPA was established in 1993, the police auditor model was relatively unknown. People were more familiar with civilian review boards, which have been in existence for over thirty years. The major difference between these two models is that civilian review boards are usually investigative bodies which make findings and place a greater emphasis on individual complaints versus an auditor model which monitors and audits the investigations conducted by the Internal Affairs Unit. The IPA focus is on identifying the underlying causal

An emerging trend in civilian oversight of police practices

factors that give rise to complaints, recommending policy changes, and monitoring the implementation of these recommendations by tracking the recurrence of similar complaints.

Office Staff and Setup

The IPA office has a total of six full time staff members to service a police department of approximately 1400 officers, in a city with almost one million people. The Auditor is a lawyer with a background in criminal law. The IPA office is located separate from the police department and from city hall. The total yearly budget is \$540,000.

Characteristics of the IPA

The IPA has three primary functions: (1) it serves as an alternate forum where people may file a complaint, (2) it monitors the ongoing investigations of citizen complaints and/or audits the completed investigations conducted by the SJPD; and (3) it promotes public awareness of a person's right to file a complaint. The IPA does not conduct investigations, but rather reviews the investigations conducted by the San

Jose Police Department's Internal Affairs Unit for thoroughness, fairness, and to insure that the findings are supported by the evidence. This review may include requesting added investigation, talking to witnesses, examining the physical evidence, attending the subject and witness officer interviews and continues until the investigation is completed to the satisfaction of the IPA. If after all investigative steps are exhausted, and the IPA still disagrees with the finding of an investigation, the IPA will meet with the Chief and ultimately the City Manager to discuss the specifics of the case. The IPA also reports to the Mayor and the City Council, the frequency and/or patterns resulting from cases in which the IPA disagreed with the findings reached by the Chief of Police.

On a quarterly basis the IPA and the Internal Affairs Unit prepare and compare statistical reports to ensure the reliability and integrity of the data reported by both offices. An analysis of the data extracted from citizen complaints form the basis of the

continued on page 11>>

Membership application

Select a membership category:



Sustaining Members

Sustaining members are organizations and individuals who wish to make tax deductible contributions to the further the goals and principles of NACOLE. *Donations begin at \$500.*



Organizational Members

Organizational members are agencies of board who provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. These agencies will receive one transferable regular membership and associate memberships for the remaining members of their boards. *Annual dues: \$300*



Regular Members

Regular members are individuals who are not sworn law enforcement officers but who work or have worked for agencies that are mandated by legislative or executive authority to investigate and review complaints against law enforcement officers. *Annual dues: \$150.*



Associate Members

Associate members are individuals concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. The members shall be able to participate in all NACOLE activities, including serving on committees, but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. *Annual dues: \$100.*



Student Members

Student members are individuals who are full-time students and are concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. Student members will be able to serve on committees but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. *Annual dues: \$25.*

All memberships include a one-year subscription to the NACOLE Review.

(over)

Membership application

Please fill in the following:

Name

Organization or company

Title

Organization telephone (with area code)

Organization address

City, State, Zip

Home address

City, State, Zip

Home telephone (with area code)

Organization fax

Home e-mail

Organization e-mail

Home fax

Membership type

Make checks payable to NACOLE

Mail form and payment to:

NACOLE

P.O. Box 1110

Lanham, Maryland 20703

Please call or email if you have questions

phone: 1-866-4NACOLE

email: Nacole95@aol.com

Communities working to get oversight in their towns:

Claremont, California: When reality invades the ivory tower

by Ellen Taylor
Claremont community leader

In a mainly Caucasian, well-heeled college community in the foothills east of Los Angeles, a routine traffic stop turned tragic when the driver, an 18-year-old African American man, was shot and killed by local police. When the two police officers were, a year later, named “Honored Employees of the Year”, the lid blew off.

Community members, seeking ways to allow a constructive approach to the interpersonal tension in Claremont, turned to Study Circles, a form of community dialogues. These forums drew participants from all over the community to come together to exchange information, share personal stories and experiences, honestly express perspectives, clarify viewpoints, and develop solutions to community concerns. Participants were encouraged to recommend formative action that they feel should be

taken to remedy the problems of the community. In this way, regular folks were enabled to play a crucial and key role in governance.

“The action phase is what attracted me to the concept since we do not get anywhere when we just talk,” states Ellen Taylor, the organizer of the program. Several hundred residents participated in the small discussion Circles and they reported on their decisions in the form of recommendations for governmental and individual action.

Several of the action recommendations related to the city police. The police and the city were urged to establish an independent Citizen Review Board which would have investigatory powers as well as the power to:

- ❖ Review, revise as appropriate, communicate to public and consistently implement nondiscriminatory policies and

procedures, recruitment policies and police academy training, eliminate racism, incorporate multicultural anti-bias curriculum

- ❖ Further develop community oriented policing; hold public forums/communicate clearly with public re: police policies;
- ❖ Make complaint process less intimidating, protect privacy of citizens; and
- ❖ Continue racial profiling study, release data to public.

Months after the recommendations were publicized, City Council has approved an ordinance setting up a Police Advisory Commission. The Commission has been granted advisory powers only, no real oversight, and clearly no investigatory powers. However, many of the tasks outlined follow the recommendations from Study Circles and other community groups.

Community activists are disappointed the Police Review Board was not allowed to have the ability and authority to investigate complaints against officers. Yet two years ago, the idea of any Police Advisory Commission would have been unthinkable, so we must view this as a glass half full - and continue to be vigilant. ■

Who are we becoming?

Just as we have profiled existing boards, so we report on groups striving to become a guiding force in their communities. We acknowledge and encourage their efforts.

Fresno, California

Committee educates themselves and others

*from Pasquale Carbone
Fresno Citizen Spokesperson*

Our group, the Central California Criminal Justice Committee, has been meeting since February 2000 in response to the growing concern surrounding racial profiling. We are a coalition of human rights advocates and other concerned citizens in the Fresno area. The goal of our group is to establish

more a formal process to review citizen's complaints and to establish a permanent civilian review board.

We are working hard to educate ourselves about what other communities have been doing. In April 2000, the ACLU of Fresno held a town hall meeting to hear people's stories about racial profiling

and DWB. In November, we sent a letter to our elected officials and police chief requesting voluntary data collection, diversity training, and data on civilian complaints. For 2001, we planning a series of workshops with resource people from cities that have established civilian oversight. ■

Communities working to get oversight in their towns

President's report

(continued from page 1)

- The new Las Vegas Board made its first findings.
- Riverside seated its first Commission, while the California Attorney General urges the city to further reforms or face suit.
- An informed citizen panel in LA issued a 200 page critique of the LA PD's operations, policies and procedures in the wake of the damage the Rampart scandal has caused. New Haven is considering establishing oversight. Omaha just did. Detroit may strengthen its model. And in

New York, the mayor and police commissioner suggest having the oversight board the prosecute misconduct allegations.

Washington DC, lethal force incidents plummeted in the two years after investigative reporting documented the city's high number of police shootings and the department had time to digest what was uncovered, to impose new investigative standards, and to improve training and supervision. And its Review Board, defunct for several years, reopened its doors. ■

recommendations made by the IPA. These recommendations include the creation, modification or elimination of policies, procedures or department rules. Since it's inception, over ninety percent (90%) of the recommendations made by the IPA have been adopted and implemented by the SJPD. The Auditor presents the recommendations to the city council for approval and at the same time, the Chief of Police presents his response to the IPA's report.

Measuring Effectiveness of a Civilian Oversight Agency

When determining the effectiveness of a police oversight program, one must consider the level of independence afforded to the agency from police and political pressures. We cannot ignore the reality that the police as a profession has significant influence over elected officials, and depending on the political climate, could influence the appointment or removal of the Executive Director and/or members of the reviewing body. The latest example was the removal of the Chair of the Police Commission by Mayor Riordan in Los Angeles, California.

In further assessing the effectiveness of a police

oversight program, the least reliable measure is the rate by which complaints are sustained. This is because each agency collects and reports statistics differently. The best measure lies in evaluating the impact in changing police behavior. It is not enough to make recommendations because most oversight models make recommendations. The litmus test is whether these recommendations are adopted, implemented and their impact tracked, measured and evaluated to insure that the sought after results are achieved. For example, three years ago the IPA recommended that certain procedures be followed by command staff following notice of a use of force by an officer. This recommendation was incorporated in the police duty manual. In 1998, the IPA examined compliance by the command staff in all those cases where serious force was used by conducting an audit of the supervisors actions and comparing them against the required duties as stated in the police duty manual. This analysis served as the basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the prior recommendation. The 1998 audit revealed that less than 50% of the com-

mand staff was complying with the directive to investigate and write a report following notification of a use of force. This information was contained in the IPA public report that was presented to the Mayor and City Council. A follow-up audit was conducted in 1999 and it revealed that 99% of the command staff was now complying with this order. That same year, the number of serious use of force complaints decreased.

Another important factor in determining the effectiveness of civilian oversight is whether a positive change in police behavior is occurring. Before behavior can be changed, you must first identify problem officers through an early warning system. A comprehensive data collection mechanism must be in place, one that captures all complaints regardless of where they are filed. This data is the basis for the Early Warning System (EWS) used by the IPA and the Internal Affairs office of the San Jose Police Department. When an officer receives three complaints within one year, regardless of the outcome of the complaint, the officer is required to meet with his supervisor, a Deputy Chief and the I.A. Commander to review the subject officer's com-

plaint file. This is not a punitive action and is designed to be a management tool and opportunity to review the officer's contacts with the public.

Community Outreach

One of the three primary functions of the IPA is to conduct community outreach. This is an area that many oversight agencies consistently neglect. Easy access to the complaint process and ongoing communication with the complainant and public at-large need to have high priority. The IPA makes presentations and attends many community events. The IPA sees this as an opportunity to learn more about the needs and concerns of the different neighborhoods and ways the IPA can better serve the community. During community forums, generalized concerns are voiced which do not involve a particular officer or occurrence. Rather than just referring the citizens to the police department, the IPA works with different units of the SJPD to resolve these neighborhood concerns.

Below is an example of how the IPA has successfully made a

continued on next page>>

difference in the neighborhoods by listening to their concerns and working with the SJPD to resolve the problem. In May of 1999, after doing a presentation at the Alma Community Center, the IPA received a letter from an anonymous resident who had attended the presentation detailing a drug and prostitution problem at a specific house in the neighborhood. The resident did not feel comfortable going to the police or anyone else for fear of retaliation. The IPA forwarded the resident's information to the appropriate police unit, maintained contact with the commander and staff and requested that the matter be investigated. The SJPD opened an investigation and with surveillance and other evidence, officers were able to execute a search warrant. Within weeks, two suspects were arrested and drugs and cash were seized. Through this collaboration between the SJPD, the IPA, and the residents, the quality of life in this neighborhood significantly improved.

Establishing a Presence in the Community

A goal for the IPA in 1999 was to establish at least one referral site per council district. Preferred sites are

community centers or other locations frequently visited by the public. The main function of a referral site is to serve as an information center for residents who may be seeking information on how to file a citizen complaint. It is the opinion of the IPA that a person will feel more comfortable filing a complaint, if he/she first makes contact at a local community organization where they can talk with someone they know and trust and who can refer them to the IPA. The IPA provides the staff at each referral site with an orientation session as well as a binder that contains detailed information about the IPA office, steps on how to file a complaint, copies of the "Commonly Asked Questions" brochure, which has been translated into five different languages (Spanish, Tagalog, Samoan, Vietnamese, and Korean). In addition, IPA material can be found at most branches of the public libraries, all fire stations and the police department's substations.

Media

A very important partner in community outreach is the media. The Auditor is frequently asked to give interviews to mainstream and multi-ethnic print and broadcast media. The media also supports the IPA by

producing and airing public service announcements.

The Independent Police Auditor Advisory Council

In 1999, the IPA formed an advisory committee called the Independent Police Auditor Advisory Council (IPAAC), which is comprised of 16 to 20 culturally diverse community leaders. The purpose of the IPAAC is to provide greater civilian input of police related concerns and issues which are brought to the attention of these community leaders by members of their respective communities. Through this committee the IPA receives input from the community at large which is used to determine future recommendations. The IPAAC members serve at the pleasure of the Auditor.

Website

In 1998, the IPA created a website on the City of San Jose's homepage where the public can obtain information about the IPA, the citizen complaint process and /or file a citizen complaint via electronic mail (e-mail). The website has proven successful in making information available to anyone who has access to a computer and the internet. The IPA has received citizen com-

plaints and inquiries not just from San Jose residents, but also from other cities and countries. The IPA averages about 2,000 visits per month to its website. The IPA year-end reports, newsletters, calendar of events and general information are available at <http://www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/ipa/home.html>

Conclusion

The IPA believes that no one can better prevent and uncover police misconduct than the police themselves, but without outside scrutiny, departments may revert to their natural tendency to let their self-policing efforts slide. Not only do scandals embarrass a police department, and destroy morale; they are also a very costly drain on public funds, which often leads to the elimination of very important social programs in cities and counties strapped with litigation costs. Police scandals can also destroy the public confidence and credibility the police need to recruit and retain personnel and carry out their police duties. San Jose is the safest large city; however, the ugly reality is that no one police department is immune to police misconduct, corruption, and brutality. Civilian oversight of police practices can

continued on next page>>

Resources for civilian oversight

Sue Quinn, President

NACOLE congratulates new publication

NACOLE congratulates **Sam Walker** on the recent publication of his book, ***Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight***, available at www.wadsworth.com. The book is of great value to anyone in oversight, and to those considering oversight. It outlines the varieties of oversight, and provides information rich in resources to tap and ideas to adapt. Look for Joe Sandoval's review in the next Newsletter.

***Bias-Based Policing* discusses racial profiling and offers suggestions to end it**

Ronald L. Davis, Regional Vice President of NOBLE (the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives) and a Captain at Oakland, Calif., Police, has authored "Bias-Based Policing" which discusses racial profiling as a symptom of bias-based policing. This paper is important for the issues it raises, the false solutions it suggests we avoid. It is useful as both a training document and as an organizational planning document. Obtain a copy by contacting Captain Davis or NOBLE on their website <http://www.noblenatl.org>

***Recruiting and Retaining Women* highlights advantages of women in law enforcement**

The National Center for Women and Policing, has produced a remarkable resource, "Recruiting and Retaining Women: a Self-Assessment Guide for Law Enforcement." Building on the research that shows women cops have far fewer force complaints, and are generally able to de-escalate incidents safely, this guide highlights the advantages of hiring, promoting and retaining more women in law enforcement, and provides the tools to do it, from the development of job descriptions to evaluating promotional processes and preventing discrimination. If you monitor or participate in any way in your law enforcement agency's hiring and promoting processes, read this document and share it with department administrators. Contact the National Center at Womencops@aol.com

***Los Angeles Sheriff's Department* report**

Special Counsel to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors Merrick J. Bobb issued the *13th Semi-annual Report on the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department* December, 2000. It includes reports on, "Shootings and Other Use of Force;" "Corruption Controls and Risk Management;" "Medical Care in the Jails; Sexual Harassment; Racial Profiling and Litigation." As in earlier publications, the reports function both as discussions of Los Angeles Sheriff's Reforms and as a model for the rest of us to learn from and use. If your jurisdiction is addressing any of the covered topics, reading this report will be worth your time. Obtain it at <http://www.co.la.ca.us/bobb.html>.

IPA model

(continued from page 12)

lesson and provide proactive means of addressing this very serious threat.

The success of the IPA is greatly attributed to the support from the community, the commitment from Mayor

Ron Gonzales, the San Jose City Council and Bill Lansdowne, the Chief of Police. It is important for elected and appointment officials to understand and feel comfortable with the role of civilian oversight so that support for police oversight is

not viewed as a lack of confidence in the police department. The San Jose Police department works with the Independent Police Auditor in a true spirit of cooperation. These agencies are mutually committed

towards obtaining one goal. The goal is to increase police accountability to the public while improving community relations and ultimately building greater public confidence in their Police department. ■

Inclusion: *The Balancing Act of Civilian Oversight*

The Board of Directors is pleased to announce NACOLE's seventh annual conference from October 9-12, 2001 in Denver, Colorado. The conference theme this year is **"Inclusion: The Balancing Act of Civilian Oversight."** NACOLE is honored to accept Denver Public Safety Review Commission's offer to host the 2001 conference. Special thanks to all the members of Commission for supporting NACOLE's work over the years and particularly Joseph Sandoval, NACOLE Board of Directors at Large, and Rose Ceja Aragon, Administrator for their support and hard work for the past several months.

The Conference will again bring together dynamic keynote speakers; innovative ideas; challenging panels; and informed discussions among those working in oversight of policing in the U.S.

Oversight has grown in the past year and we look forward to new oversight practitioners joining NACOLE. Washington DC, Riverside and Claremont California, Las Vegas, Nevada, Omaha, Nebraska and others have opened oversight offices since we last met.

The conference will be held at the Adam's Mark Hotels and Resorts, centrally located in the heart of Downtown Denver's famous 16th Street Mall, a mile-long pedestrian promenade lined with over 150 shops, restaurants, and entertainment establishments. The hotel is also four blocks from the Colorado Convention Center and less than two miles from the prestigious Cherry Creek Shopping District. There

is free shuttle buses that run its length, providing easy access to all major attractions. The Denver International Airport is just 26 miles away and there is shuttle services for about \$17.00 each way and \$30 round trip.

We hope that you and your agency will be present at this year's conference to contribute your ideas on the issues that we all face together.

If you have specific ideas on how your agency would like to contribute to the conference agenda, whether by recommending a speaker, presenting a panel or sponsoring an event please contact any NACOLE board member.

NACOLE STRIVES TO

- * Facilitate and involve the community as a true partner in community policing.
- * Provide educational opportunities and technical assistance to existing and emerging organizations that perform civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- * Encourage and promote the highest ethical and professional standards in organizations providing civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- * Provide a national forum for exchange of information for agencies that provide civilian oversight of law enforcement.

BENEFITS OF THE CONFERENCE

Exposure to critical law enforcement issues shaping our future.

Opportunities to undertake new roles in civilian oversight nationally and locally.

Opportunities to meet and share ideas with leaders in the civilian oversight field.

Membership in a fast-growing national network of civilian oversight and law enforcement leaders across the United States.

Development of essential skills to involve the community as a partner in community policing.

Extensive national dialogue between law enforcement personnel, citizens and civilian oversight practitioners.

Define what communities need to know when establishing a civilian oversight system, changing existing review mechanisms and what accomplishments can be expected in the short and long term in any jurisdiction.

Network with city and state agencies to promote civilian oversight and police accountability reform processes.

Explain types of resistance used to derail or co-opt any form of civilian oversight system and effective strategies of countering that resistance.

Discuss what a community can expect to gain from a functioning civilian review process, and how citizen review agencies are effective in reductions of municipal liability suits.

PANELS & WORKSHOP TOPICS:

PANEL DISCUSSION: Addressing “Biased Based Policing”

This panel will focus on how to identify bias-based policing, methods for communities to use to recognize and test what they know, what racial profiling statistics have to teach the justice system and how oversight processes can contribute to law enforcement providing unbiased policing.

PANEL DISCUSSION: Carving Progress from Crisis

Cincinnati is the latest urban region on our minds as we shape this conference. In this workshop we will examine Cincinnati and other cities in the aftermath of community crises and anguish. We want to heal our communities of the painful conflicts they suffer when community and police trust breaks down, but how do we begin? What does it take? Who's done it successfully? What does success mean? How will we know? And how do we strengthen oversight in the service of community cohesion and rebuilding trust?

WORKSHOP: Case Study

Reviewing Evidence; Applying Policies and Using Common Sense:

In this workshop a Review Board Agenda will be presented to participants. This Agenda will have several civilian complaint investigations to be reviewed, with findings and recommendations to be made. Small groups will examine the statements of complainant, witnesses & subject officers, and review other evidence to come to a conclusion. If no conclusion can be made, the groups will outline why they cannot decide, and will identify further investigation they must conduct or have their Internal Affairs Units conduct before completing the investigation. Some groups make take the opportunity to craft policy recommendations as well as make findings as to misconduct allegations.

WHO SHOULD ATTEND

Civilian Oversight Agency personnel; Police Commissioners/Chiefs; Law Enforcement Agency personnel (sworn and non-sworn); Police Union Representatives; Internal Affairs Staff; Social Service Agencies; Federal, State, and Local Officials; Special Interest Groups; Communities interested in creating civilian review boards. Volunteers, Colleges, Universities and students. The general public is also invited.

HOTEL REGISTRATION FORM

ADAM'S MARK DENVER, CO
Reservations: 1800-444-2326 or
303-893-3333 Fax 832-0320

GUEST ROOM RATES/ GROUP RATES:

Current Room Tax 13.55%

Room	Single Rate*	Double Rate*	Triple Rate*	Quad Rate*
Deluxe Queen	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$132.00
Deluxe Double	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$132.00
Deluxe King	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$132.00
Concorde Double	\$121.00	\$156.00	\$191.00	\$206.00
Concorde King	\$121.00	\$156.00	\$191.00	\$206.00
Deluxe Room 1 Bed	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$131.00
Executive Suite	\$295.00	\$295.00	\$295.00	\$295.00
Presidential Suite	\$795.00	\$795.00	\$795.00	\$795.00
Tower Deluxe	\$495.00	\$495.00	\$495.00	\$495.00
Plaza Deluxe Suite	\$495.00	\$495.00	\$495.00	\$495.00
Accessible Queen	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$131.00
Accessible Double	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$131.00
King Bed of Suite	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$131.00
Queen Bed of Suite	\$ 86.00	\$101.00	\$116.00	\$131.00

※ **CUTOFF: September 8, 2001.**

- ※ The rooms are held under the "NACOLE" block. **Please request this block when calling for reservation:**
- ※ Group rate is available 3 days pre and 3 days post conference based upon availability.
- ※ Attendee reservations must be accompanied by a deposit in the amount of one night's accommodation to guarantee a room which will be credited to the last night for which the reservation was made.
- ※ Guaranteed reservations are held (without occupancy) for one night only and not the entire length of the stay.
- ※ Deposits from attendees are refundable if notice of cancellation is received and can be confirmed, with a cancellation number issued by the Hotel, at least 48 hours prior to arrival date.
- ※ Check-out time is 12:00 noon. Guest check-in cannot be guaranteed prior to 3 p.m. on the day of arrival.
- ※ All guests are required to present a valid credit card or cash deposit upon registration unless prior credit approval has been obtained from the Hotel.

CREDIT INFORMATION:

CARDHOLDER NAME: _____

TYPE OF CARD: _____ **EXP. DATE:** _____

CARD NUMBER: _____

MASTER CARD INTERBANK NUMBER (4) DIGITS: _____

BILLING ADDRESS: _____

Please return this form and one night's deposit to:
ADAM'S MARK DENVER
1550 Court Place Denver, Colorado 80202
Attn: John Hogan, Convention Service Manager

NACOLE 2001 CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM

Name: _____

Title/Agency: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State/Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

EARLY REGISTRATION (by August 24, 2001)

- \$250 Regular Member
- \$250 Organizational Member
- \$275 Student Member
- \$300 Associate Member
- \$300 Non Member

Registration Plus Membership

- \$550 Organizational Member
- \$400 Regular Member
- \$400 Associate Member
- \$300 Student Member

Take 20% discount for groups of two or more from the same agency
Add \$50 for each **late registration postmarked August 24, 2001** or after

Amount Enclosed \$ _____

Please make checks payable to **NACOLE** and mail it to:
P. O. Box 1110 Lanham, MD 20703

For office use only

Date postmarked _____ Date paid _____

Received by _____

Cash Check Check No. _____

Member Status _____

Registration Status Early Late

< **No refund for cancellation after September 8, 2001**

Travel arrangement must be done early and through your local travel agency or any major airline carrier.



The NACOLE Review is published twice a year
for the members of NACOLE.

National Association for Civilian Oversight of
Law Enforcement
P.O. Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703

1-866-4NACOLE ■ Fax (301) 794-0264
Email: nacole@nacole.org
or contact the NACOLE board at
<http://www.nacole.org>

Editor: Suzanne Egbert
segbert@yahoo.com
© 2001 NACOLE, Inc. All rights reserved.

THE NACOLE REVIEW

National Association for
Civilian Oversight of Law
Enforcement
P. O. Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703

first class mail